



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

this subject he will consider at some other time. However important these variations may be, we must agree, I think, with Martin, when he says in his 'Parole et Pensée':

"Les habitants du Midi préfèrent aux sons sourds *â, ô, eu, é*, les sons clairs *a, o, eu, è*; dans le Nord de la France, c'est précisément le contraire, et nous ne voyons pas que, pour être plus harmonieux et plus sonore, le français du Midi soit moins intelligible, moins correct que celui du Nord."

EDWIN S. LEWIS.

Princeton University.

### ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

*The Stanford Dictionary of Anglicised Words and Phrases.* Edited for the Syndics of the University Press, by C. A. M. FENNELL, D. Litt., etc. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1892. 4to, pp. xv, 826.

THE acceptance, eleven years ago, of a special bequest of £5000 made by Mr. J. F. Stanford, a London barrister, imposed upon the University of Cambridge the responsibility of completing a dictionary, outline and basis for which were furnished in some part by the testator's own notes. The title of the resulting work indicates roughly its character. What hitherto has been consigned to a supplement or appendix, confessedly makeshift in character, or attempted only in separate manuals, and that avowedly for catchpenny purposes, is here dignified as an object of special scholarly effort.

The editor selected, Dr. Fennell, was not given full discretionary power. A committee<sup>1</sup> of preferred authority determined first the specific aims of the book, defined the special connotation of the term *Anglicised*, and drew up a scheme governing the matter of inclusion. The laxity of the definition is not such, unfortunately, as to temper properly the stringency of the scheme. The two do not work together, as they could have been made to do, to allow the editor liberty without permitting him license.

*Anglicised* is defined as applying to words and phrases, (a) "borrowed and wholly or

partly naturalised"; (b) "used in English literature without naturalisation"; (c) "familiarised by frequent quotation." The "scheme," that is, the committee's formal statement of its rulings regarding inclusion, is so confused by special exceptions and numerous conditioning notes, that we beg simply to give its content. While not professedly including technical terms, the 'Dictionary' is to comprise, (1) all non-European words and phrases borrowed directly,<sup>2</sup> and all European, except French; (2) all Latin and Greek phrases, and those words which retain their original form, or whose original form is found not earlier than 1470; (3) all French words and phrases which "retain a characteristic French pronunciation of one prominent syllable *or more* (!)," and all words of French origin brought in since 1470 and found in French form before 1612, or after that in italics.

The main objects of the work are:—(1) to enable the English reader to find out the meaning and history of the foreign words and phrases, which occur so frequently in English literature; (2) to register the increase of the English vocabulary from foreign sources since the introduction of printing; (3) to record all English words of foreign origin, which have retained or reverted to their native form.

Here are two aims definitely announced, one popular and one scientific. This fact is accurately recognised in the book's make-up, about 50% of the items being, we are told, devoted to "the first object which is popular." The obvious comment must be made that much would have been gained by making the work purely scientific—yet this would have been an absurdity in the face of the 'New English Dictionary' and distinctly a violation of Mr. Stanford's wishes as inferred from his notes. The items they furnish<sup>3</sup> plainly indicate that he meant the work to be (in one relation) frankly popular—a record of foreign words and phrases in current use, including those partially naturalised. Had this single intention, and this only, been followed out, a work of real value for popular reference would have resulted, and moreover the lapse of only a half century or so would have sufficed to

<sup>1</sup> Rev. Profs. Mayor and Skeat, Prof. Bensly, Mr. Aldis Wright, and Dr. J. P. Postgate.

<sup>2</sup> "With or without change of sound or form."

<sup>3</sup> They are starred in the 'Dictionary.'

render it of real scientific value. As it is, the work presented us is curiously full of error and inconsistency—useless relatively speaking for popular reference, and for scientific purposes interesting, rather than certainly instructive—but a partial record of the fact of today, and a woefully incomplete one of the fact of yesterday.

The faults of the Scheme, notably those arising from its over-ingenuity, need no comment.—they become readily apparent when it is considered with respect to the aims of the 'Dictionary' as announced. We pass on then to a consideration of the work itself, and in doing so cannot refrain from a reference to its excellence in externals. The printed page could not be bettered. We discover but one typographical error, other than those in the errata—the accent is omitted in the word *macramé*. Several slips in style occur. The words *stresslessness*<sup>4</sup> and *forcibility*<sup>5</sup> are used. It is safe to say they appear for the first and only time in any dictionary. "The editor's assistant," we are told "has displayed quite a genius for the kind of work." This use of *the* as a self-explanatory demonstrative is novel. "Gymnasium," it seems "has been Anglicised in Holland as *gymnase*." We wonder at this; even Maarten Maartens might scarcely venture so to enrich the English language. Under *Frank*, the phrase is used, "formed in 3 c., A. D." *Ego et rex meus* is luminously explained as "'I and my king' (according to the Latin order), the position giving no dignity to the *ego*, as was supposed by Woolsey's critics." *Endymion* is

"the name of a youth famous for beauty and capacity for sleep, with whom the moon-goddess (Diana, Phoebe, Artemis) fell in love, and visited him on Mount Latmos."

*Cinque cento* is defined as

"It, 'five hundred,' a short way of expressing the period of Renaissance which began early in the century of which 1501 was the first year."

Rowland's *Macassar* is an "oil largely advertised." A *crevasse* is a "long vertical fissure in a glacier." *Entasis* is "a slight convexity of the shaft of a column."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Introduction.      <sup>5</sup> In definition of *emphasis*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Haman*, *emphasis* 1, *crapula*, *édition de luxe*.

In form and arrangement, there are numerous slight inconsistencies. *Magnesium* and *magnesia* have separate headings, while *lithium* is included under *lithia*. *Aesculapian*, *Egyptian*, *Florentine* have separate articles, while *American* and others are included under their originals. Words are entered now in their foreign form (often unwarranted by quotation), now as naturalised;<sup>7</sup> now in modern form, now in archaic.<sup>8</sup> Variant forms are given at one time at the beginning, at another at the end of the articles, sometimes are omitted,<sup>9</sup> sometimes have separate articles.<sup>10</sup> In some cases important variants are not given separate references to their originals.<sup>11</sup> Such instances of carelessness are, however, neither numerous enough, nor of a character, materially to affect the book's value. A quotation borrowed from the 'New English Dictionary' is credited under *benecarlo*, but not under *margoso*. Under a number of nouns in *trix*, reference is made for no reason to the corresponding masculine forms; under as great a number no such reference is made. *Kalends* is spelled with a capital; *ides* and *nones* are not.

It seems very questionable taste in a dictionary to call derisive attention to incorrect forms in the quotations by the particle *sic*. Moreover, this has almost always been done in quotations from old books<sup>12</sup>—in the case of errors of typography, not of scholarship.

Abbreviations of book-names should have been included in the list of abbreviations. How many can decipher off-hand *Howell*, *Fest*, *Let.*, and similar curtailments? This reminds us that there are more varieties of Latin in this 'Dictionary' than one generally meets,—they are not, however, explained in the list of abbreviations. There is plain Lat., and Mod. Lat.,<sup>13</sup> and New Lat.,<sup>14</sup> and Late Lat.,<sup>15</sup> and (upon one occasion) Bot. Lat.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *colombario*, *corbaccio*, with *Creese*, *crimson*. *Dahabieh* is spelled differently from the original Arabian and every form in the quotations.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *cinnamon*, *crimson*, etc.

<sup>9</sup> For example, *demiurge*, *elicampagne*, *cogniac*, *sinamome*, etc.

<sup>10</sup> For example, *coucher*, *couchee*.

<sup>11</sup> For example, *emery*. *Catsup* is not given a separate reference, though the only quotation has that form.

<sup>12</sup> *Epinethus* (*sic*) Howell, 1642; *gynasia* (*sic*) Holland, trans. Pliny, *floritur*, *landsturm*, etc.

<sup>13</sup> For example, *Anglomania*, *megatherium*, *phantasmagoria*.

<sup>14</sup> For example, *entozoa*.

<sup>15</sup> For example, *per se*.

<sup>16</sup> See *epidendron*.

Study reveals the fact that Mod. Lat. means the Latin spelling of a word newly coined from the Greek.

In indexing phrases, first words have been taken as indices of place. This is excessively annoying to the reader. Moreover, it reduces the editor to the absurdity of placing the phrases beginning with *le* apart from those beginning with *les*, and worse still, those in *l'* apart from the *la*'s and the *le*'s. Of course, the simple way, and one considerate of the reader, would have been to index by letter-sequence, independent of word division. The way chosen was one convenient only for the editor himself. He had all his *le*'s, *la*'s, and so on, in separate lists convenient for checking.

The 'Dictionary' contains 12,798 articles, treating of 13,018 words and phases. The following facts are of interest. There are 2617 French derivatives in original form, 3797 Latin, 495 Greek (including naturalised forms), 1199 Italian, 716 Spanish, 336 Hindoo, 225 Arabic, 147 Turkish, 113 Celtic, 83 American Indian. It seems evident that the first letters of the 'Dictionary' were more carefully worked at than the latter.<sup>17</sup> Diacritical marks are not attempted as a rule; stress, only, is marked; It is surely to be regretted that the editor goes out of his way to pronounce the *ch* of *chivalry* soft. Is its proper and historical pronunciation a thing of the past?

Etymologies are inserted as a rule, the Introduction tells us, only when new light is afforded. Evidently the editor could not resist many, for example those of *orchid* and *buccaneer*, because of their interest and prettiness. The fabulous derivation of *meringue* is given a new lease of life. *Ruelle* is described as "Fr. *lit* 'bedside'"; literally, of course, it is nothing of the sort, but not going back too far, it was the space between a bed and the wall,

<sup>17</sup> For example, as regards inclusion. An average of the great dictionaries taking the letters by three's, gives a series of percentages which may be taken as a modulus. The Stanford series is given as denominator :

$\frac{21.06}{37.44}$	$\frac{9.79}{12.68}$	$\frac{15.15}{8.87}$	$\frac{4.86}{4.19}$	$\frac{9.27}{9.85}$	$\frac{14.70}{12.80}$	$\frac{20.05}{11.25}$
$\frac{c}{37.44}$	$\frac{f}{12.68}$	$\frac{i}{8.87}$	$\frac{l}{4.19}$	$\frac{o}{9.85}$	$\frac{r}{12.80}$	$\frac{u}{11.25}$
$\frac{4.61}{2.59}$	$\frac{.55}{.37}$					
$\frac{x}{2.59}$	$\frac{z}{.37}$					

The divergences are notable; the first six letters, for example, occupy, as a rule, less than a third; in the Stanford more than a half.

not the bedside. The sense 'bedside' resulted from this, and particularly (for a time) in England. Why necessarily should *eureka* 'be spelled *heureka*'? The word's form testifies to the fact that it passed straight into common speech from the Greek original, without the intervention of Latin spelling. It may offend the ear of the classical scholar, but scarcely that of the student of English. What difference is there, we might ask, between "Old It. *farfalla*," and the modern word? The editor puts the cart before the horse in an amusing way, when, in speaking of the word *Negus*, he suggests that Beresford's witty quotation from Milton

"Nor could his eye not ken  
Th' Empire of Negus." 18

may have had something to do with its derivation.

Passing to the matter of inclusion, in order to give some idea of the surface error and inconsistency present in the book, we point out the omission of the following familiar words: *foible*, *invalide*, *mackintosh*, *declassé*, *nocturne*, *postiche*, *bugloss*, *borage*, *redowa*, *bestiarium*, *flux*, *pleineaire*, *remarque*, *zenith*, *nadir*, *pulsatilla*, *scarlatina*, *mastiff*, *plague*, *caniche*, *Bessemer*, *myopia*, *ogre*, *Pentecost*, *trochee*, *smilax*, *stramonium*, *Carrara*, *directrix*, *hypogeum*,<sup>19</sup> *khismet*, *conte*, *pastel*, *rampant*,<sup>20</sup> *acta*,<sup>21</sup> *scaena*.

To emphasise this point, we compare the dictionary with itself. Of the following paired words, the italicised are admitted, the others are not:—*emphyema*, *empyreuma*; *ample*, simple; *amplitude*, certitude, fortitude; *Argand*, Bunsen; *Asgard*, Midgard, etc.; *bal paré*, *bal masqué*, *bal poudré*; *Avatar*, Karma; *chylus*, *chymus*; *hinterland*, *gymnasium*, *brodstudien*, *rathshaus*, *realschulen*; *basso profundo*, *tenore robusto*; *Devanagari*, Prākṛit.

The editor handles certain questions regarding inclusion in the Introduction. Words in *-or* caused him much trouble. There are two

<sup>18</sup> Milton, 'Paradise Lost,' xi, 397, quoted by Beresford, 'Miserics,' ii, 95 (5th ed.).

<sup>19</sup> Though it occurs in the quotation under *colombario*, itself an obsolete word.

<sup>20</sup> Italicised by Ben Jonson.

<sup>21</sup> Common in the 16th century.

classes—Latin originals and English coinages. These could have been discriminated. Unfortunately, some came in before 1470; those, of course, had to be excluded. It was a matter of special difficulty, and the voluntary readers evaded words of this character. His embarrassment resulted in the curious decision to admit *all* words ending in *or*, whether Latin or not, which are on the sunny side of 1470. It is only fair, he thinks, to the general reader, who might look up a word in *or* under the belief it was Latin. Why a reader would look up words like *actor*, *enunciator*, *perambulator* in this work, it is hard to imagine. The value of the 'Dictionary' would not have been impaired, if they had all been omitted. As it is, numbers<sup>22</sup> are overlooked. No result of practical value is obtained, and the etymological difficulty might just as well have been left to Dr. Murray's slow, but sure, unloosing.<sup>23</sup>

The decision to accept a presumption as certainty in the case of words of doubtful origin, Latin or French is rather unsatisfactory. It involves the throwing out of many words as adapted from the Latin, and not borrowed from the French. Rather than give a decided opinion in a matter so subtle, would it not have been better to state the doubt? In any case, why does not the reasoning applied to words in *or* apply here? As regards vexing questions whether words in-*ado* are French or Italian, it need only be said that they are to be intelligently decided, as a rule, only by a toss-up.

Exotic words are excluded, excepting such names of vehicles, vessels, implements, coins, commodities, as seemed likely to be imported. Why then *bota*, *abbatage*, *brial*, *intarsiatore*, *intarsiatura*, *landmannschaften*? Geographical names applied to varieties of an article are excluded, for example, *Demerara* (sugar). This ruling does not hold for laces and wines. The editor's taste in these matters is interesting. He shows a preference for point-lace of various sorts; as regards wine, we find *Heidsieck*, *Beaune*, *Montefiascione*, *Valdeponas*, etc., but not *Mumm*, *Larose*, and dozens of others,

for which quotations could have been readily furnished. *Chianti* is not given in its familiar English use as meaning a *vin ordinaire* of Italian growth. The best vintage of Burgundy is pointed out. *Bordeau hammer* is described as having been a customary comic phrase—a doubtful matter. Finally, if laces and wines are admitted, why not pottery and porcelain, other than *delf*, *faience*, *majolica*? And why not cheeses?

Turning from the Introduction, we note curious contradictory rulings from the point of view of form. There has been nothing said of modern scientific coinages. We find a number included,<sup>24</sup> while hundreds quite as worthy are excluded. In the case of *abiogenesis*, and *biogenesis*, one cannot resist the malicious surmise that they were included in order that the editor might correct Huxley in his coining, a thing he is careful to do. Why should a number of words from the Latin in *icus*,<sup>25</sup> *alis*,<sup>26</sup> *anus*,<sup>27</sup> *inus*,<sup>28</sup> be admitted, and others be excluded,—and this quite irrespective of the question whether they came through the French or not, or were coinages by analogy? Why are *Americanise*, *Caesarise*, and *Adonise* admitted, and their numerous analogues passed by? Why are *Caesarism*, *Euphuism*, *Guevarism* admitted, and *mesmerism*, *hypnotism*, *idiotism*, and *alienism* refused? Why are scores of words from the French in *er* omitted, when numbers are given admission? Why are freak-words like *hocus-pocus*, *conundrum*, *dahlia*, *gardenia*, *balloonomania*, *circumbendibus* included, and others like *alarum*, *panjandrum*, *omnium gatherum*, *sanitarium*, and the interesting nondescript *tantrum*, omitted?

If now we take up special classes of words, grouped together by a relationship of meaning, we come upon further inconsistency and omission. Of familiar terms in everyday life there are plenty; for example, *barège*, *foulard*, *crêpe lisse*, *filoselle*, *souchong*, *cru*, *sauce piquante*. With these compare omissions; for example, *chiffon* (fabric) *lingerie*, *gants de Suède*, *crêpe de Chine*, *jersey*, *balayouse*,

<sup>24</sup> *apodiabolosis*, *exo-* and *endo-skeleton*, *exo-* and *endosis*, *melodeon*, *Anglomania*, *Anglophobia*, etc.

<sup>25</sup> *scorbutic*, *Bacchic*, *Galic*.

<sup>26</sup> *Bacchanal*, *Iscariotical*,

<sup>27</sup> *Aesculapian*, *Caesarean*, *Egyptian*, *Vesuvian* (!)

<sup>28</sup> *Alpine*.

<sup>22</sup> Reflector, enactor, professor, etc.

<sup>23</sup> The 'Stanford' is, by the way, corrected by aid of the 'N. E. D.' as far as *E—Every*.

*oolong, brut, sauce tartare, fromage.* The famous historical terms *mervilleuse* and *incroyable* are not given. *Marron*, a firework, is noticed under the Italian word for chestnut, but the ubiquitous sweetmeat in its familiar French form, either when *glacé* or *dés-guisé*, receives no notice. The fruit-growers *tasche* and the billiard-player's *massé* and the printer's *stet* should have been given a place. *Jocoseria, voodoo, japonaiseries, les désagréables, débardeur, cloches, bad, fjeld, fels, hof, wald*, and the geographical prefixes *kil-* and *nan-*, should have been explained as by strict analogy with words included.<sup>29</sup> *Rastaquoures*<sup>30</sup> and *croquis* suggest two classes of French slang-words, only a few of which are admitted and those, like these, rare. Famous names, used as type-names, are included; the selection made is a curious one; cf. *Egeria, Buridan, Aeneas, Brantôme, Anaschar, Astolpho, Rosinante, Nathaniel*, admitted with *Electra, Duns Scotus, Calypso, Dido, Voltaire, Sinbad, Aladdin, Roland, Sancho Panzo, Daniel*, omitted,—not to speak of troops of others. Often admission of a name depended, apparently, simply upon the chance discovery of a single quotation showing its use as a type-name, but in the case of *Atalanta* and *Astolpho*, the names are not used in the quotations as type-names at all. Proceeding and noting as omissions only words that should have been admitted by strict analogy, we find of terms in Music<sup>31</sup> over a hundred omissions, general scientific terms,<sup>32</sup> 140, Medicine,<sup>33</sup> 131, Astronomy<sup>34</sup> 10, Architecture<sup>35</sup> 24, Philosophy<sup>36</sup> 14, Geology<sup>37</sup> 10, Botany<sup>38</sup> 24, terms

<sup>29</sup> Taking such as suggested themselves, we note in all 43 omissions.

<sup>30</sup> Miss Braddon; but where are her countless others, and Miss Edwards', Miss Thackeray's, Hook's, Albert Smith's, Lever's and Lover's?

<sup>31</sup> For example, *motet, nocturne, virelai, prose, quatre mains*, etc.

<sup>32</sup> For example, *aardvark, copperas, coccyx, flux, congar, echelon* (lens) etc.

<sup>33</sup> For example, *vagina, triceps, variola, risus sardonius, suspiria, occiput*, etc.

<sup>34</sup> For example, *Saros, zenith, nadir*, etc.

<sup>35</sup> For example, *clerestory, corbel, donjon*.

<sup>36</sup> For example, *cornutus, verstand, verkunft, empiricism*, etc.

<sup>37</sup> For example, *jade, corundum, cinnabar*, etc.

<sup>38</sup> For example, *horae canonicae, cotta, soutane, antependium* (cf. *antepori*), etc.

ecclesiastical<sup>39</sup> 16, Art<sup>40</sup> 20. As special instances, we might note that many names of muscles in *or* are admitted, as many excluded; certain names of organ-stops and terms in dancing and cooking are admitted, others excluded; extremely unusual botanical names are often admitted, others (not in our list) excluded. Admission seems to have been the result simply of hitting hap-hazard on a quotation. That the intricacies of the 'Scheme' are in part responsible for this, there is no doubt; undoubtedly it complicated matters in a way that produced general confusion. But how are we to take a case of this sort:—the month-name, *January*, is in, *February* is not; *March* is in, *April* not; *May, June, and July* are in, *August* not. It is absurd to pretend an etymological reason for this. Again, why should words without definition or derivation be admitted, even though nothing in the quotation justifies their admission; for example:

"She left the Aeolian harp in the window . . . and coiled herself up among lace pillows and eider *blemos*."<sup>41</sup>

This word looks at least like a respectable alien, but the matter becomes ridiculous in a case like the following:—"There are plenty of sea-gods little better than salt-water kelpies or marine *bunyips*."<sup>42</sup> The Celtic word *kelpie* is not included, by the way (and in passing, is there such a thing as a salt-water one?). This reminds us of the fact that in innumerable cases anglicised words found in quotations in the 'Dictionary' itself, have not been included, for example, *troll* and *nixie* under *Alp*, a nightmare. Of four words in quotation under *bianco*, three are indexed. Three words in quotation under *escu* are not included. *Petard* is not admitted, even on Shakspeare's authority, though it occurs in a curious variant form (*Peter*) in a quotation under *blunderbus*; surely it is no whit farther from its original.<sup>43</sup> From

<sup>39</sup> For example, *mezzo-rilievo, pleine aire, siccatis, Anadyomene*, etc.

<sup>40</sup> C. Kingsley, 'Yeast.'

<sup>41</sup> *Athenæum*, Jan. 14, 1888, p. 47.

<sup>42</sup> Under *embrocado, mandrita*; under *chorion, amnios*; under *cicada, tettinix*.

<sup>43</sup> Under *Adam*, we have *Adamical, Adamitical, Adamist, Adamite, Adam's apple*. Under *America, American, Americanism*, and (mirabile dictu!) *Americomania*. Surely this is a work of supererogation.

'Quits' is taken the following:—'Is this Peissenberg what you call an *alp* or *alm* . . . is it one of those pasture grounds on the mountains . . . ?' *Alp* is here illustrated as meaning a mountain pasture. In the first place the word is purely exotic; in the second there is no such German word, it properly being *Alpe*; in the third it is dialectical (dialect forms are professedly not admitted); in the fourth the word *alm* which follows—the regular German word—is not admitted, though resting on equal authority of quotation with the word *alp*.

By way of dismissal to this part of the subject, we would ask a question. Should not the scheme of a dictionary of this character have been made at least sufficiently broad to include words like *eglantine*, *ergot*, *granite*, *terrier*? Or take the word *etiolate*—has it anything but a foreign flavor? Yet though this useful word is omitted, the exotic *Spaniolate* exactly similar in form is included.

Just what the character of the definitions should be in the case of a work like the 'Stanford' is, perhaps, a question. Had its eye been single, that is scientific, definitions would have been as a rule non-essential. Unfortunately, deference for its popular aims carried the day. The definitions are, as a result, amusingly circumspect about trifles, elaborate and diffuse in their treatment of even the simplest matters, and often discursively instructive in directions that carry quite out of the dictionary's province. Of this the *Saturday Review* seems rather to approve. It asks in admiration if anyone would ever have supposed that *Mexican caviare* was made of the eggs of a fly. Apart from the fact that there is no such thing as *Mexican caviare*, and that the authority quoted by the 'Stanford' employs the term only because the Mexican *ahuauhtli* is used in a way similar to the European delicacy, it is quite needless to say that the 'Dictionary' had no call to fill the place either of an unabridged or an encyclopaedia. Eleven several headings were not necessary under the word *accent*, or under *color* thirteen. The important point is when and in what form these words were adopted—derived meanings are not 'Anglicised'; the children and grandchildren of a naturalised foreigner are not

aliens whose names must be filed on the Court-lists. What reader will turn to the 'Stanford' for an exhaustive discussion of the senses in which the word *accent* is used, or for instruction regarding the laws of stress and accent in English speech? Why should we learn here that *color* is a "particular variety of appearance," depending on the reflection of light, or the novel and interesting information that

"Sometimes white and black are regarded as being without colour, according to which view only the results of various decompositions of white light are colours"?

Military and architectural meanings are added under certain terms and not under others. Under many words, derivatives are added, a thing which the Introduction expressly said would not be done.<sup>44</sup> *Album* is given as "American (*sic*) for *visitor's book*"; this bold American innovation is not illustrated by a quotation. *Agitator* is defined as "a shaker in a physical sense." *Lasquet* is adequately described as a game in which one player holds the bank and the others play against him. *Bel étage* is defined as "best storey, first floor. N. B. *belle étage* is wrong."

The slight touch of cynicism in the following definition is probably not intended.

"*Chloe*; name given by Horace to a young woman who is supposed to slight his addresses (*Od.*, 1.23, iii, 26), hence used in modern poetry as the fictitious name of any young woman."

This is probably only *naiveté*, as other definitions show:—

"Don Juan, Sp. 'Sir John' the name of a hero of Spanish romance, dramatised in Italy and England,<sup>45</sup> represented as the seducer of a lady (or many ladies) of *good birth*, and as a murderer, and as being eventually taken alive down to Hell. The well known *Don Juan* of Byron is a mere frivolous libertine."

*Double entendre* is

"a word or phrase used in a double sense, one of which is generally innocent, while the other is more or less unbecoming."

*Encore* is "often heard as *Caw!*" To *compare* is

"to give *viva voce* or in writing, the degrees of comparison of any adjective. For instance,

<sup>44</sup> Is Molière unworthy of remembrance?

<sup>45</sup> Cf. *baggage*.

a teacher or examiner says 'Compare *much*.'  
*Ans*: 'Much, more, most.'"

Definitions that involve real error are not infrequent. We note one particularly which is, by the way, quoted from the 'New English Dictionary.' The item is as follows:

"*Bague* sb: Fr: ring, brooch, trinket, 1475. Medea tooke alle the most richest Jewels and bagues portatif, Caxton, Jason, 106."

If the definition stands, Caxton then meant to say Medea took all the richest jewels and rings that could be carried. Bagues here, as the reader has perceived, is used in its regular Old French meaning<sup>46</sup> of goods, chattels, bundles—"such goods as could be carried." The definition of the 'New English Dictionary' is undoubtedly wrong. *Actualité* is defined as "real existence, reality opposed to potential or to imaginary existence." Both quotations given show the error here made, though in one the word is used in its abstract, in the other in its concrete, sense. One is from Thackeray:—"We are not going to praise it; it wants vigor . . . and what you call *actualité*." The other is from the *Athenæum*, "French dramatists lose little time in the production of *actualités*." The word of course is artist's slang. Precisely the opposite mistake is made in the case of *morbidezza*, which is defined as used by artists, while its use in its primitive sense is passed by. Carelessness appears in a definition following one just spoken of. The quotation is from Nathaniel Fairfax: "God's being is such altogether in a readiness or *actualiter*." Here *actualiter* is defined as an adverb, when it is plainly the substantive,=*nunc ipsum, res ipsa*, a common word in late philosophical Latin, and familiar to every reader of Sir Thomas Browne.

The following moralising definitions display a somewhat misdirected energy. *Battue*, "an unsportsmanlike butchery of game"; *Boudoir*

"Fr. lit. a place to sulk in, *bouder*; originally a private apartment where a man could study or meditate without interruption, now a private retiring room, where a lady can be alone or receive her intimate friends. Dictionaries are polite enough to add the idea of elegance to the definition, but this quality depends upon the taste of the occupier."

<sup>46</sup> For example, *dominicin, linctus, literator*.

Passing now to the matter of quotations, it is only fair to say that the 'Stanford' puts on record a large number of valuable quotations. At the same time there is a lack of system, completeness, and consistency, as marked have as elsewhere. Several hundred carefully selected books have been read we are told, for the purpose of collecting the literary materials upon which the best part of this work is based. We repeat with increased emphasis that a detailed list should have been given.

As concerns authorities in general, it may first be noted that while it is interesting to have a minute made of even a small part of the foreign words and *blumenphrasen* of the sixteenth and seventh centuries, it is impossible to regard the greater number of these as in any sense anglicised—the editor indeed might have known how impossible it was in any case to "round in" all the innumerable exoticisms, lugged by scores into the polite speech and the literature of those periods. As it is, we wonder at his choice of authorities. Howells and Harvey are names often seen, but Lyly, Browne, Fuller, scarcely ever appear. The Latin terms and phrases in Dryden's 'Essay on Dramatick Poetrie' are actually, apparently, entirely unnoticed. Harvey, the vain and quarrelsome pedant, whose pages are glanced into by perhaps one person a year, is often referred to—while a famous classic, and one constantly read, like Sir Thomas Brown's 'Religio Medici' is passed by completely. The first half dozen words and phrases, therefrom taken at random, were not to be discovered in the 'Dictionary.'

It is surprising to find George Augustus Sala appealed to again and again as authority for the standing of anglicised French. It is the exotic words and phrase, not the standard, which find place in the fashionable novel. Many references are made to what is nothing better than ephemeral trash. For example, we find the word *aasvogel* on authority of Haggard's 'Jess.' *Hinterland*, *Schwärmerei*, and other German words, are given on the single authority of the *Athenæum* where moreover they are used in quotation,—*Brod-studien* similarly on the strength of the *Saturday Review*, and *Denkmal* on that of *Echo*, a publication which certainly has not made much



noise in the world. Words like *Weltschmerz* and *Zeitgeist* may be considered as anglicised, but those above mentioned certainly possess no such claim.

*Affiche* is given as having been anglicised in "the 14, 15 cc."; no quotation is brought forward in proof. *Allegator* is marked rare—a fact borne out by the absence of a quotation. We note several such cases.<sup>47</sup>

A rather amusing error is to be found under *girasole*<sup>2</sup> defined as a sunflower; the only quotation given is from Kane:—"in the midst of which like a large girasole flashes the round sun." Only a desire to find an English analogue for the French *girasole* could have caused this interpretation of Kane's meaning. He refers of course to the girasole, the fireopal. So undoubtedly in an Arctic atmosphere the sun would look—certainly would not "flash like a sunflower."

The quotation "A bisogno, a cocoloch, as thou art" is given by a most amusing error under *cockroach*. *Cocoloch* is simply Old French *coqueluche*, a hoodwearer, rustic, simpleton.

With regard to the phrases and familiar quotations from foreign tongues, little need be said. Nothing could be more curious than the ruling which has governed admittance and exclusion in this particular. Long and perfectly unfamiliar phrases from sixteenth century authors are admitted, while most familiar daily quotations are excluded,—and *vice versa*. The "English reader" may better betake himself to any cheap handbook than to this specially prepared dictionary. The omission of famous phrases that have become in translation a part of the texture of daily speech, seems particularly unfortunate, for example,

*soufflet le chaud et le froid; c'est le commencement de la fin; consuetudo est secunda natura; fortunae filius; les larmes à la voix; le style est l'homme même; olet lucernam; splendida vitia*;<sup>48</sup> *vivere est cogitare* (Cicero); *major ceremoniarum; imitatores, servus pecus; giovine canti, diavolo vecchio; gens de lettres; flux de bouche; a capite ad*

*calcem; facta non verba; aide toi, le ciel t'aidera.*

So also familiar legal words and maxims:—*consuetudo est altera lex; actus me invito, factus non est meus actus; incerta pro nullis habetur; non constat; occasio facit furem; res iudicata; ipso jure; mare apertum; multitudinem decem faciunt; litera scripta manet; jus possessionis.*

It seems unfortunate that explanations of the historical and other associations of the phrases have so generally been omitted. *Sauve qui peut* is explained but the 'Dictionary' is not even at pains to say that *Semper eadem* was the motto of Elizabeth, or refer to the occasion which makes the words *Esto perpetua* truly memorable, while in the case of *pour encourager les autres* and *Solvitur ambulando*, the explanation, which is absolutely necessary, is not given.

From the one hundred and forty omissions of familiar phrases and quotations noted, we select the following examples:—*labor omnia vincit improbus; Caesarem vehis Caesarisque fortunam; certum quia impossibile; cherchez la femme; experto credite*;<sup>49</sup> *clarior e tenebris; in hoc segno vences; la genie, c'est la patience; Malbrouck s'en va t'en guerre; mehr licht; ora et labora; anch' io sono pittore; -non Angli sed angeli; sic transit gloria mundi; allez vous en; a la belle étoile; la donna est mobile*, etc.

Enough however of mere fault-finding. We may conclude as follows. As a book of popular reference, the 'Stanford Dictionary' will never fill a large sphere of usefulness; the English reader will find it better in every case to consult the 'Imperial' and the 'Century.' For the philologist, there is much included that is of value; he will speedily determine the books equation of error, and use it to some profit, until the 'New English Dictionary' is complete. To sum up, it will always be a work of which to say, "Perhaps you will find what you want in the 'Stanford,'" rather than instantly and conclusively, "Go to the 'Stanford.'"

CLARENCE GRIFFIN CHILD.

Johns Hopkins University.

<sup>47</sup> That is, Tertullian's famous phrase is omitted, while *splendidia peccata* of nameless origin is included.

<sup>48</sup> *Experto crede* is given, but Virgils' phrase is not.